

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 are pending.

Claims 19-20 are cancelled.

Claims 1-8, 17 and 18 are allowed.

Claims 11-13 are objected to.

Claims 9, 10, and 14-16 are rejected.

Claim 9 is amended to claim a difference function that is calculated between "the theoretical instant at which the utilization of the data begins and the theoretical instant at which the utilization is to be triggered". Support for this amendment is found in the specification on page 6, lines 28-33. This element is the same element as found in allowable Claim 1.

1. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection of Claims 9-10 and 14

The Examiner rejects Claims 9-10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Greer et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,574,798, hereafter referred to as 'Greer'). Applicant disagrees with this ground of rejection.

Claim 9, now amended, claims "a function of the difference between the theoretical instant at which the utilization function of the data begins and the theoretical instant at which the utilization of data is to be triggered". This function is neither disclosed nor suggested in Greer.

Applicant also disagrees with the Examiner's contention that the "display time" of Greer is the same as the claimed "utilization of processed data having to be triggered at a given theoretical instant" (see page 2, third paragraph of the Office Action). The section cited to by the Examiner in Greer details Fig. 2 that a user would input for the invention, specifically values pertaining to "time", "maxdisp", and "mindisp". The value "time" is defined as the "desired total

presentation time for all images combined" (Greer, col. 3, lines 8-9). The value "mindisp" is defined as the "minimum display time for any single image" (Greer, col. 3, lines 14-15). The value "maxdisp" is defined as "a maximum display time for any single image". In such, these values are related to the duration of time for when a single image is displayed (mindisp, maxdisp), and the duration of time when all of the images combined are to be displayed (time).

These values have nothing to do with "utilization of processed data having to be triggered at a given theoretical instant" as claimed in Claim 1 which is not the same thing as the duration of time for displaying an image that is cited to in Greer by the Examiner. Furthermore, the formula given to calculate such display duration further reiterates the concept that Greer is concerned with time of duration for displaying an image (see Greer col. 5, line 50 to col. 6, line 6). When Greer further details, "the converter program begins to sum the display times" (Greer, col. 6, lines 19-20). If the display time was the same thing as the "utilization of processed data having to be triggered at a given theoretical instant" as claimed in Claim 9, the text of Greer would not make any sense. Specifically, there is no constraint in Greer regarding the time at which the data has to be displayed, unlike what is claimed in Claim 9.

For the reasons given in connection for Claim 9 above, Applicant requests that the Examiner remove the rejection to this claim. In addition, Applicant requests that the Examiner remove the rejection to Claim 10 and 14 as such claims depend on Claim 9.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection of Claims 15-16

The Examiner rejects Claims 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer in view of Yagasaki et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,847,770). Applicant disagrees with this ground of rejection.

As stated above, Greer does not disclose or suggest the concept of a


"theoretical instant" as claims in independent Claim 9, from which Claims 15-16 depend on.

For the reasons given above, Applicant asserts that Claims 15-16 are patentable as such claims depend on allowable Claim 9. Applicant requests that the Examiner remove the rejection to these claims.

It is believed that no fees are owed in response with this action. If any fees are owed, please charge these fees to Deposit Account 07-0832.

It is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,


A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Joel M. Fogelson', is written over a horizontal line.

By: Joel M. Fogelson

Reg. No. 43, 613

Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
June 6, 2005